UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/723,406	11/25/2003	Milton Stoller	1166/66306	2670
79697 Cooper & Dunh	7590 12/11/200 nam, LLP	EXAMINER		
30 Rockefeller		WEATHERBY, ELLSWORTH		
20th Floor New York, NY	10112	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3768	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/723,406	STOLLER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ELLSWORTH WEATHERBY	3/68	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth teter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sleet forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply original for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory and the corresponding amount of the correspo	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. \square The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>08/26/2008</u> . A brief in c	compliance with 37 CER 41 37 mus	et he filed within two m	onthe of the
date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or ar Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	ny extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37	7(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.
AMENDMENTS			
3. A The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>The proposed amendments would require</u> 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	further consideration beyond a nor	minal search in the an	<u>t</u> . (See 37 CFR
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. A For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-28 and 32-36</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and 			
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			.
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Dote the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (l	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.			
/Long V Le/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768			

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has set forh additional limations to claims 1 and 2, including the limitations "without processing a second coordinate from the second image" and "without processing a second coordinate from the first stereo view". Applicant alleges that these amendments would not require undue examination on the part of the Office. The Examiner stands that these limitations would have to be addressed and would require further consideration beyond the 02/26/2008 Office Action. Although Section 5 of the 02/26/2008 Office Action rejects non-elected claims 29-30 and 37-38, the Examiner stands there was no intent to treat these claims as pending and their rejection in the 02/26/2008 Office Action was an oversight on the part of the Examiner.